

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No. CV 25-2314-MRA (KS)

Date: July 25, 2025

Title *Vigen Tovmasyan v. Target Corporation et al.*

Present: The Honorable: Karen L. Stevenson, Chief U.S. Magistrate Judge

G. Roberson
Deputy Clerk

N/A
Court Reporter / Recorder

Attorneys Present for Plaintiffs: N/A

Attorneys Present for Defendants: N/A

Proceedings: (IN CHAMBERS) ORDER DENYING ORIGINAL AND AMENDED STIPULATIONS FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER WITHOUT PREJUDICE [DKT. NOS. 31, 33]

The Court is in receipt of the parties’ proposed Amended Stipulated Protective Order, filed by Defendant Target Corporation on July 18, 2025 (“Amended SPO”). (Dkt. No. 33.) The parties originally submitted a proposed Stipulated Protective Order (“Original SPO”) that was not in compliance with this Court’s procedures. (Dkt. No. 31.) Specifically, the parties failed to email a copy of the *complete* proposed Original SPO to Chief Magistrate Judge Stevenson’s chambers in Word format, “including the full text of the stipulated protective order **and the signatures of all stipulating counsel.**”¹ (See Dkt. Nos. 31, 32 (emphasis added).)

Therefore, on July 11, 2025, the Court issued a Minute Order: (1) encouraging the parties to thoroughly review the procedures on Judge Stevenson’s webpage (with a link provided for convenience); (2) directing the parties to email a **complete** Word version of the Original SPO to the Chief Magistrate Judge’s chambers no later than Friday, July 18, 2025; (3) reminding the parties that they will receive expedited consideration if they also provide an optional, red-lined comparison between the form SPO on the Court’s website and the proposed Original SPO; and (4) **expressly warning the parties that the failure to comply with the July 11, 2025 Minute Order would lead to the denial of the Original SPO.** (Dkt. No. 32.)

On July 18, 2025, despite not being ordered to do so, the parties filed the pending Amended SPO. The Amended SPO does not appear to be a final copy ready for the Court’s review, as it

¹ Chief Magistrate Judge Stevenson’s procedures are available at <http://www.cacd.uscourts.gov/honorable-karen-l-stevenson>.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No. CV 25-2314-MRA (KS)

Date: July 25, 2025

Title *Vigen Tovmasyan v. Target Corporation et al.*

contains irrelevant material such as this Court’s instructions in its model SPO for drafting a statement of good cause. (See Amended SPO at 1.) Notably, the Amended SPO also copies the Court’s sample good cause statement word-for-word without making any particularized showing of good cause under the facts of this case. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c) (a court may issue a protective order “for good cause”); see also *Kamakana v. City and Cnty. of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1176 (9th Cir. 2006) (finding that where “the parties had simply stipulated to the protective order, a particularized showing of ‘good cause’ to keep the documents under seal had never been made to the court **as required by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c).**”) (emphasis added); see also *San Jose Mercury News, Inc., v. U.S. Dist. Court – No. Dist. (San Jose)*, 187 F.3d 1096, 1103 (9th Cir. 1999) (holding that a showing of good cause is necessary to obtain a protective order that satisfies Rule 26(c)). Finally, this time the parties did not email a clean Word version of the Amended SPO at all, but instead only attached an optional, red-lined version to the email.

For the reasons stated above, and because the parties were expressly warned of the consequences for failing to comply with the Court’s July 11, 2025 Minute Order, both the Original SPO (Dkt. No. 31) and the Amended SPO (Dkt. No. 33) are **DENIED** without prejudice to the parties submitting a stipulated protective order for approval that complies with this Court’s procedures and orders.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Initials of Preparer

:

gr